

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,167	HOEKS ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hung Henry V. Nguyen	2851	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hung Henry V. Nguyen. (3)_____.
- (2) Jean Paul Hoffman. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 28 August 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claims 1-12 and 30-40.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tamawaga et al (U.S.Pat. 5,777,838) and Logan et al (U.S.Pat. 6,754,062).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant explained the claimed invention and pointed out differences between the cited references to the claimed invention. Applicant argues that Tamagawa and Logan fail to disclose using a conductive layer having a specific resistivity less than 10 Ohm.m on a plurality of pins in contact the object, Particularly, Applicant argued that the conductive layer (18) of Logan is not configured to contact with the object,,as recited in the instant claims. The Examiner agreed to withdraw to the rejection set forth in the previous office action .